



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/143, 967 08/31/98 BERTMAN

R RP9-95-017V

LMC1/0802

EXAMINER

IBM CORPORATION
PSG IP LEGAL DEPT
DEPT 90CA/BLDG 002-2
PO BOX 12195
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK NC 27709

HUYNH, B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2773

DATE MAILED: 08/02/00

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/143,967	Applicant(s) Bertram et al
Examiner Huynh-Ba	Group Art Unit 2773

Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 31, 1998

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle 1035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

- Claim(s) 37-72 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) 37-72 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2773

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. This application discloses and claims only subject matter disclosed in prior Application No. 08/703,171, filed 8/22/96, and names an inventor or inventors named in the prior application. Accordingly, this application may constitute a continuation or division. Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of the filing date of the prior application, attention is directed to 35 U.S.C. 120 and 37 CFR 1.78.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 68 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 37-72 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-36 of U.S. Patent No. 5,864,340, claims 1-26 of

Art Unit: 2773

US patent No. 5,805,159, and patented claims 1-20 of US patent No. 5,805,158. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the broaden claims 37-72 are covered by the patented claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 37-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capps, US patent #5,666,502, in view of US patent #5,367,619 (Dipaolo et al).

- As per claims 37,49,61: Capps teaches a handheld computer system comprising:
a housing, a processor mounted within the housing for processing digital data, a memory for storing digital data, a display, an input digitizer, a control program stored in the memory for processing of digital data (Figures 1, 2; Col. 4, line 39 - Col. 5, line 52). The system displays a form defining data fields and supplies a list of possible data entry for a defined data field (figure 5s). The list is derived from captured user inputs. Capps fails to clearly teach the entry of data to the field (i.e., automatic entering data to the field without being selected by the user). However, in the same art of electronic form data entry, Dipaolo et al teach the automatic filling a data field ("fill in the blank") with an entry of the most possible data predicted by the system

Art Unit: 2773

(Col. 2, lines 50-55; Col 6, lines 31-38; Col 12, lines 1-12). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Dipaolo's teaching of automatic filling a data field to Capps for filling the data field with the most possible data entry from the list. Motivation of the combining is for the advantage of automatic filling of the data field without action by the user.

- As per claims 38,50,62: The data entered is default value since it is subjected to be modified (Dipaolo's col. 2, lines 52-55; col. 12, lines 1-12).
- As per claims 39, 51,63: The default entry is selected from a predictive list based on a pre-determined algorithm (Capps' figures 5B, 6A).
- As for claims 40,41,52,53,64,65: Dipaolo et al teach the automatic filling a data field ("fill in the blank") with an entry of the most possible data predicted by the system (Col. 2, lines 50-55; Col 6, lines 31-38; Col 12, lines 1-12)
- As per claims 42, 43,54,55,66,67: Per Capps the most possible data entry can be selected from the history list based on recency of use (Capps' figures 5B, 6A).
- As per claims 44,56,68: The most possible data entry can be selected from the list based on frequency of use (Capps' figures 5B, 6A).
- As per claims 45,57,69: The most possible data entry can be selected from the list based on a user selected weight determination of the recency and frequency of usage (Capps' figures 5B, 6A).

Art Unit: 2773

- As per claims 46,58,70: The list comprises a leading portion based on the recency of use and a trailing portion based on frequency of use (Capps' figure 5A; col. 11, lines 32-61).

- As per claims 47,59,71: Data entered in to the fields are captured and stored in the history list (Capps' col. 2, lines 30-33; col. 10, lines 27-29; claim 2).

- As per claims 48,60,72: Capps teaches a handheld computer system comprising: a housing, a processor mounted within the housing for processing digital data, a memory for storing digital data, a display, an input digitizer, a control program stored in the memory for processing of digital data (Figures 1, 2; Col. 4, line 39 - Col. 5, line 52). The system displays a form defining data fields and supplies a list of possible data entry for a defined data field (figure 5s). The list is derived from captured user inputs. Capps fails to clearly teach the entry of data to the field (i.e., automatic entering data to the field without being selected by the user).

However, in the same art of electronic form data entry, Dipaolo et al teach the automatic filling a data field ("fill in the blank") with an entry of the most possible data predicted by the system (Col. 2, lines 50-55; Col 6, lines 31-38; Col 12, lines 1-12). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Dipaolo's teaching of automatic filling a data field to Capps for filling the data field with the most possible data entry from the list. Motivation of the combining is for the advantage of automatic filling of the data field without action by the user. The default entry is selected from a predictive list based on a pre-determined algorithm (Capps' figures 5B, 6A). Dipaolo et al teach the automatic filling a data field ("fill in the blank") with an entry of the most possible data predicted by the system (Col. 2,

Art Unit: 2773

lines 50-55; Col 6, lines 31-38; Col 12, lines 1-12). Data entered in to the fields are captured and stored in the history list (Capps' col. 2, lines 30-33; col. 10, lines 27-29; claim 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent #5,390,281(Luciw et al).

- As per claims 37,40,49,52,64,61: Luciw et al teaches a handheld computer system comprising:

a housing, a processor mounted within the housing for processing digital data, a memory for storing digital data, a display, an input digitizer, a control program stored in the memory for processing of digital data. The system displays a form defining data fields (col. 5, lines 51-59; col. 10, lines 56-62; col. 18, lines 20-32), predicts user intent, and supply a data entry for a data field (col. 16, lines 54 - col. 17, line 19).

- As per claims 38,50,62: The data entered is default value since it is a hypothesis and subjected for confirmation (col. 6, line 59 - col. 7, line 4; col. 14, lines 36-38).

Art Unit: 2773

- As per claims 39, 41,42,51,53,54,63,65,66: The default entry is selected from a predictive list based on a pre-determined algorithm (col. 11, line 65 - col. 12, line 2).
- As per claims 43,55,67: Per Luciw et al the most possible data entry can be selected from the history list based on recency of use (col. 14, lines 43-46; col. 16, lines 1-16).
- As per claims 44,56,68: The most possible data entry can be selected from the list based on frequency of use (col. 14, lines 40-43; col. 16, lines 1-16).
- As per claims 45,57,69: The most possible data entry can be selected from the list of weighted determination of the recency and frequency of usage (col. 14, lines 40-46; col. 16, lines 1-16).
- As per claims 47,59,71: Data entered in to the fields are captured and stored in the history list (Luciw et al' col. 2, lines 30-33; col. 10, lines 27-29; claim 2).
- As per claims 48,60,72: Luciw et al teaches a handheld computer system comprising: a housing, a processor mounted within the housing for processing digital data, a memory for storing digital data, a display, an input digitizer, a control program stored in the memory for processing of digital data. The system displays a form defining data fields (col. 5, lines 51-59; col. 10, lines 56-62; col. 18, lines 20-32), predicts user intent, and supply a data entry for a data field (col. 16, lines 54 - col. 17, line 19). The data entered is default value since it is a hypothesis and subjected for confirmation (col. 6, line 59 - col. 7, line 4; col. 14, lines 36-38). Data entered in to the fields are captured and stored in the history list (Luciw et al' col. 2, lines 30-33; col. 10, lines 27-29; claim 2).

Art Unit: 2773

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Claims 46,58,70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent #5,390,281 (Luciw et al).

- As per claims 46,58,70: The history list is formed based on frequency and recency of use (col. 14, lines 40-46; col. 16, lines 1-16), all possible user intents are prioritized. Luciw et al et al fail to clearly teach that the giving more weight to the recency of usage such that the list comprises a leading portion based on the recency of use and a trailing portion based on frequency of use. However, giving more weight to the recency of usage would have been an obvious design preference.

Inquires

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires to fax a response, (703) 308-9051 may be used for formal communications or (703) 308-6606 for informal or draft communications. NOTE: A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for informal facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huynh-Ba whose telephone number is (703) 305-9794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8.00AM to 4.30PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Kim, can be reached on (703) 305-3821.

Art Unit: 2773

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Huynh-Ba
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2773
7/30/00


BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER